UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/634,269	10/634,269 08/05/2003 Ming Gao Yao		12553/73	7073	
KENYON & K	7590 08/28/200 ENYON	EXAMINER			
Suite 600	-l C44	BLOUIN, MARK S			
333 W. San Carlos, Street San Jose, CA 95110-2711			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2627		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/28/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/634,269	YAO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	MARK BLOUIN	2627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth it ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tened statutory period for reply original contened statutory period for reply original contents.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS		21	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b They raise new issues that would require further con They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		'aral Cladenara	. (P (b
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (I13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Mark Blouin/		
	Primary Examiner of Art	Unit 2627	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The issue appears to be that the Applicant disagrees upon whether the pin element "is directly attached to and physically connected along a surface of a first component and a surface of an arm portion" as written in Claim 1. The Applicant argues: For example, column 3, lines 32-44 states: "Each solder joint 12 includes a pin 18 inserted into hole 20 in rotary arm 16. Each hole 20 can be drilled into rotary arm 16 at a cost which is cheaper to produce than the tapped holes required to secure flex cable 14 to rotary arm 16 with a screw. Pin 18 is pressed into hole 20 in rotary arm 16. Flex cable 14 includes a guide hole 21 for receiving each pin 18 when flex cable 14 is properly aligned adjacent to rotary arm 16. Hole 21 is preferably larger in area than hole 20 so that pin 18 can easily fit through it. In preferred embodiments, a solder pad is placed around hole 21. After flex cable 14 is placed over pin 18, it can be soldered in place, thus securing flexible cable 14 to rotary arm 16." This section describes pin 18 is pressed into hole 20, and that hole 21 is larger than hole 20. Therefore, if pin is pressed into hole 20, and hole 21 is larger than hole 20, it stands to reason that pin 18 is not directly attached to and physically connected to alleged first arm portion 14 - as shown in Figure 1 and as argued above. As such, Figure 1 clearly shows that pin 18 is not directly attached to and physically connected to at least the alleged first arm portion 14. Therefore, the current rejection is lacking.

The Examiner interprets "directly attached" as fastened, secured or joined. Cox shows the pin element directly attached to the first arm portion 14 by solder joint 12 and press fit into rotary arm 16. The Examiner poses the question: If the pin element, which is designed to hold the flex cable 14 and rotary arm 16 together, is not directly attached or physically connected to either, what is holding the structure together?

The rejection is upheld and the Final rejection is still deemed appropriate.

2